

### **REMARKS**

In the Office action, claim 39 was objected to for improper dependence; claims 8, 19, 24, 28 and 32 were rejected as anticipated by Crum '394; claims 8, 10, 14-16, 18-21, 23-28, 30, 32-34, 36, 38 and 39 were rejected as unpatentable over Jahn in view of Crum; claims 8-11 and 14-36, 38 and 39 were rejected as unpatentable over Madden in view of Crum; claims 8-11 and 14-36, 38 and 39 were rejected as anticipated by Friel; and claims 9, 11, 22, 29 and 35 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn in view of Crum and Corrigan.

This amendment accompanies a Request For Continued Examination filed herewith. The independent claims have been amended to further point out the claimed invention. The independent claims 8, 19, 24 and 28 have all been amended to recite that remote access includes having first and second building sites at different geographic locations. Although it is believed that 'first and second geographic locations' as originally claimed was clear, the amended language underscores that the remote access is not just within a single facility. The original disclosure referred to "sites" such as a manufacturing site or a customer/production site. The ordinary meaning of 'site' includes a spatial location for a town, monument, building and so on, or the space occupied by a building. The claims are amended to recite a 'building site' to clarify that the manufacturing site and customer site are different buildings to clarify being at different geographic locations. Accordingly, these amendments do not add new matter. The independent claims are also amended to recite air pressure and material flow rates are part of the real time operating data that is accessed remotely. Independent claims 19 and 24 are further amended to recite that the two building sites are a customer and the manufacturer of the application system.

Crum '394 relates to a system that utilizes LAN type networks. There is no teaching or suggestion that the system of Crum would be implemented in two geographically different


locations. Applicants are of course familiar with the Crum system which in practice was implemented at a single geographic location. There is no suggestion in Crum to have a remote access function at two geographic locations, especially customer and manufacturer. None of the art of record suggests the concept of remote access to a customer site from the manufacturer's site to monitor real time operating data of a material application system.

It is recognized that some of the secondary references suggest the use of the Internet and remote access. Applicants claims are not so broadly drawn that they can be rejected simply on the basis that a reference teaches use of the Internet. Applicant's claims are specifically drawn to a material application system in which real time data of that system is accessed remotely. Nothing in the secondary references of Jahn, Friel, Madden or Corrigan suggests such a concept. The secondary references relate to vehicle assembly plants and/or paint production. The Office has not pointed to any specific teaching or suggestion that any of those references relates to monitoring the actual material application system. Again, it is pointed out that in Jahn Figs. 6A and 6B relate to a simulation. This is not real time monitoring of the actual application system.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the various dependent claims as such claims do recite additional patentable subject matter, however, detailed comment will be deferred pending further examination of the independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 02/07/2005

By:   
Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176  
Phone: (216) 622-8200